

REMARKS

I. General.

By way of the aforementioned amendments to the claims, Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4-10, and 14, cancelled claims 3, 11-13, and 15-16, and added new claims 17-42. Pending claims 1-2, 4-10, 14, and 17-48 consist of a total of 42 claims, of which 4 are independent claims. Accordingly, enclosed herewith, please find credit card payment form PTO-2038, which remits payment in the amount of \$1,310.00 for 22 total claims in excess of 20 (\$1,100.00) and 1 independent claim in excess of three (\$210.00).

The disclosure has been objected to because, according to the Examiner, the term “deivation” on Pg. 3, ln. 1 was a misspelling of “deviation” and because the term “1001” on Pg. 17, ln 28 should read “1011”. By way of the aforementioned amendments to the specification, Applicants have replaced the term “deivation” with the term “deviation”. Additionally, by way of the aforementioned amendments, the term “1001” has been replaced with the term “1101”. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objections to the disclosure have been obviated.

The drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for not containing the reference signs “20”, “26”, and “605”. By way of the aforementioned amendments figure 1 has been amended so that reference numerals “20” and “26” now appear and figure 6 has been amended so that reference numeral “605” appears. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objections to the disclosure have been obviated.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention. By way of the aforementioned amendments to the claims, Applicants have provided antecedent basis for all terminology in claims 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these rejections have been obviated.

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because, according to the Examiner, the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have obviated this rejection by amending claim 1 to recite “detecting an error condition”

in the body of the claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these rejections have been obviated.

Claims 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,872,351 to Ruesch (hereinafter referred to as “Ruesch”). Applicants have amended claims 14-16 so that they relate to a computer program product comprising computer usable medium including executable code for executing a process comprising a number of steps. The media of Ruesch fails to teach or suggest the steps recited in the pending claims 14-16. By way of just an example, the media of Ruesch simply does not detect an error condition in the manner recited in claims 14-16.

Furthermore, with respect to amended and new claims 1-2, and 4-10 and new claims 17-48, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for at least the reason that the media of Ruesch simply does not detect an error condition in the manner recited therein.

III. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the subject matter of the present application is novel, nonobvious, and useful. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objections be withdrawn and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Dated: May 2, 2008

/Michael Pruden/
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Michael Pruden, Reg. No. 52,135
Ollila Law Group, L.L.C.
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995